

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEGALFORCE RAPC WORLDWIDE,
P.C, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LEGALZOOM.COM, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-07194-MMC](#)

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT; VACATING
HEARING**

Re: Dkt. No. 54


Before the Court is plaintiffs' Motion, filed February 14, 2018, "for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint." Defendant LegalZoom.com, Inc. has filed opposition. Plaintiffs have not filed a reply. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court deems the matter suitable for determination on the parties' respective written submissions, VACATES the hearing scheduled for April 6, 2018, and rules as follows.

Under the Local Rules of this District, a a party seeking leave to file an amended complaint "must reproduce the entire proposed pleading and may not incorporate any part of a prior pleading by reference." See Civil L.R. 10-1. Here, plaintiffs, in support of the instant motion, have not submitted a proposed Second Amended Complaint, nor even explained what proposed amendments they seek to make.

Accordingly, the motion is hereby DENIED, without prejudice to plaintiffs' refiling the motion, accompanied by a proposed Second Amended Complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 14, 2018


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge